



The Task Force on Court Facilities
455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

Meeting Report

March 1, 2000
Napa Valley Marriott, Napa, CA

<p>ATTENDEES:</p> <p>TASK FORCE MEMBERS:</p> <p>PRESENT: Hon. Daniel J. Kremer, Chair Mr. Greg Abel Mr. Wylie Aitken Ms. Yvonne Campos Mr. John Clarke Mr. Mike Courtney Sheriff Robert T. Doyle Hon. Gary Freeman Mr. David Janssen Mr. Fred Klass Hon. Michael Nail Hon. Wayne Peterson Hon. Charles V. Smith Mr. Anthony Tyrrell Hon. Diane Elan Wick</p> <p>ABSENT: Hon. Joan B. Bechtel Mr. Hector De La Torre Hon. Jerry Eaves</p> <p>TASK FORCE STAFF: Mr. Robert Lloyd, Project Coordinator/Manager, Facilities Unit Ms. Patricia Bonderud, AIA, CSI Facilities Planner Mr. Bruce Newman, Facilities Planner</p>	<p>PRESENTERS: Mr. Andy Cupples, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Medenhall Mr. Tom Gardner, Vitetta Group Ms. Kathleen Halaszynski, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Medenhall Mr. Jay Smith, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Medenhall Hon. W. Scott Snowden, Presiding Judge, Superior Court, County of Napa Mr. Jose Guillen, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court, County of Napa</p> <p>CONSULTANTS TO THE TASK FORCE: Ms. Kathy Bruns, Daniel C. Smith & Associates/Vitetta Group Mr. Alton Chow, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Medenhall Ms. Kit Cole, Vitetta Group Ms. Jill Kuper, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Medenhall Mr. Simon Park, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Medenhall Mr. Dan Smith, Daniel C. Smith & Associates/Vitetta Group</p> <p>GUESTS: Mr. John Abbott, Orange County Mr. Robert Boyle, HLM Design Mr. Kevin Carruth, GSA, Santa Clara County Ms. Barbara Dunmore, Riverside County Mr. Joseph T. Fallin, Superior Court, County of Los Angeles Mr. Dean Felton, Omni-Group Inc. Ms. Karen Finn, California Department of Finance Ms. Denise Gordon, Superior Court, County of Sonoma Ms. Catherine Knighten, Orange County Mr. Dave Kronberg, GSA, Sonoma County Mr. Rubin Lopez, California State Association of Counties Ms. Sally Lukenbill, California Department of Finance Mr. Nick Marinovitch, San Diego County Mr. Jack Miller, San Diego County Ms. Marilyn Mitchell, Superior Court, County of Yolo Mr. Garry Raley, Superior Court, County of Riverside Mr. John Siden, Yolo County Mr. John Van Whervin, Superior Court, County of Los Angeles Mr. Kent Yeargin, Superior Court, County of Yolo</p>
---	--

I. OPENING REMARKS – Justice Daniel Kremer

- 1) Justice Kremer opened the Task force meeting at 10:00 AM.
- 2) The Task force reviewed and unanimously approved the meeting report from the December 8 & 9, 1999 meeting in Costa Mesa (Meeting #9).
- 3) Justice Kremer announced receipt of a letter from the California State Association of Counties' (CSAC's) Advisory Committee on Trial Court Facilities expressing concern about decisions made on the evaluation process by the task force at its December 8 & 9, 1999 meeting. The letter requested that their concerns be reviewed at the next task force meeting. Discussion of the CSAC letter was not added to this meeting's agenda because the letter was received minutes before the start of the meeting. Justice Kremer stated that the letter will be reviewed by the chair and staff and discussed with CSAC representatives prior to the next meeting and, if appropriate, included on the May 31 task force meeting agenda.
- 4) Justice Kremer reviewed the Standards/Evaluation Committee's February 1, 2000 recommendations on the disposition of review comments received on the Preliminary Determination: Trial Court Facility Guidelines. Judge Peterson, committee chair, noted that no major changes to the text of the guidelines are recommended, however, several clarifications and minor changes are proposed. No discussion was requested. The committee's recommendations were unanimously approved.
- 5) Staff provided task force members with their recommendations for the disposition of review comments received regarding the Preliminary Determination: Appellate Court Facility Guidelines and the Preliminary Determination: Facility Guidelines for Technology in the Courthouse. The task force members voted unanimously to refer the matter to the Appellate Court Facilities, Technology and Security working groups for their recommendations.

II. MITIGATION WORKING GROUP CHARTER – Mr. Robert Lloyd

Mr. Lloyd presented the proposed charter for the Mitigation Working Group that was approved conceptually by the Task Force at its December 1999 meeting. Mr. Abel was concerned that court administrative staff was underrepresented. He noted that court staff is most familiar with court operations and is best equipped to address the issues charged to the working group. Mr. Janssen agreed. Mr. Abel suggested that a judge from a small court be added because they typically understand court operational issues. Membership would include:

- Judge from a large court
- Court executive from a medium-sized court
- Judge from a small court
- Court executive from a small court
- County administrative officer or assistant from a large county
- County administrative officer or assistant from a small county
- Member of the bar
- AOC Trial Court Services representative

The working group charter, with this change, was approved unanimously.

III. PLANNING COMMITTEE-SOUTH – Mr. Jack Clarke, Chair & Mr. Andrew Cupples

- 1) Mr. Cupples explained the steps in the review process:
 - Planning committees will review each county report, including the evaluation of existing facilities and planning options.
 - DMJM will incorporate changes directed by the committee into the report.
 - Survey team leaders will subsequently meet with larger counties/courts to present the report. Reports will be sent to smaller counties and discussed in a conference call.
 - The county/court will then have 30 days to review the report and provide a written response,
 - The committee will review the county's/court's comments and decide what action to take, if any.

Mr. Cupples noted that existing county court facility master plans are reviewed as part of the evaluation process and when appropriate their recommendations are incorporated into the report.

- 2) Mr. Abel stated that the meeting notes from the January planning meetings focused on one planning option for each county reviewed; implying that it is the task force's recommended course of action. He emphasized that the task force decided not to make a specific planning recommendation but rather present several options that establish the range of costs for addressing a court's needs. Mr. Lloyd noted that the committees did not recommend a single planning option. The meeting notes will be corrected to reflect all options discussed.
- 3) Mr. Clarke explained that Judge Stephen Dombrink, chair of the Unification Working Group, presented the group's recommendations to the committee at their January meeting. The unification working group's recommendations and task force comments follow:
 - a) "Although a unified superior court must perform all court functions, it does not follow that every court building in a county must be made suitable for every function. By shifting court functions among existing locations, a unified court can make the maximum use of existing facilities. Court planners should look to whether a given facility could be recycled to a new use that does not require all of the features of a full-service court building."
 - (1) Mr. Janssen noted that using security as an overriding evaluation criteria for existing courts may make it difficult to recycle a facility to alternate uses. Mr. Lloyd explained that security is only overriding with in-custody courtrooms. Judge Peterson commented that it is too expensive to make all courtrooms multipurpose. Mr. Freeman mentioned that circulation in smaller court facilities might need to be improved so that all their courtrooms are multipurpose. Mr. Cupples reminded all that the team is not telling the courts how to operate, but how buildings can best be used with minimum capital investment.
 - b) "When evaluating court-facility needs, planners should think in terms of various courthouse "models". Some of these are full service court buildings; civil-only buildings; criminal all-purpose buildings; criminal arraignment and pretrial buildings; community courts, mini-courts and neighborhood courts; remote courts; specialty courts and alternatives to courtrooms."
 - c) "Court planners should give a broad definition to the term "court facility" and consider such alternatives as service centers, kiosks and walk-in courts."
 - d) "When choosing the location of a court facility, planners should consider the distance between court buildings, the driving time from population centers, and population density. Every community of more than 20,000 people should have ready access to a facility where people can deal with traffic tickets, small claims, and non-jury civil matters."
 - (1) Task force members debated whether population or driving time defines accessibility but did not arrive at a conclusion.
 - e) "Once the courts of a county are unified, criminal arraignments may be conducted at locations other than the former municipal courts. Planners should consider a regional arraignment court at the county jail if that is where newly arrested defendants are held. Another alternative is to provide arraignment courts at city jails."

The task force unanimously accepted the Unification Working Group's report taking the "community of 20,000" in item d) under consideration.
- 4) Mr. Cupples brought up the issue of evaluating trailers that are used for court support facilities. Mr. Smith noted that they should be evaluated as short-term and phased out as new facilities are built. It was noted that modular buildings, when appropriately designed and built, can be long term facilities as opposed to "trailers" used for short term requirements. It was agreed that trailers are, typically, not appropriate for long-term use but should still be evaluated as any other space.
- 5) Upcoming Planning Committee Meetings: Mr. Cupples will notify all task force members of future meetings so they may plan to attend if they wish. A weekly schedule will be

mailed out. The north and south meetings will be scheduled a week apart so that task force members may attend both.

6) Riverside:

(1) Background:

- (a) Unified Court system, criminal in-custody cases are handled at facilities capable of accommodating in-custody needs.
- (b) 16 facilities with one planned for construction in Temecula; 92 total courtrooms with 8 planned in Temecula (+ 4 in shell space); total area occupied is 365,000 component gross square feet (CGSF).
- (c) 2 leased facilities housing courts, mainly small claims and traffic.
- (d) 66 judicial full time equivalents.
- (e) Facilities are partially centralized (family, criminal and civil) based on facility capability.
- (f) County has a master plan that is updated periodically.
- (g) Facilities range from 100 years old (Riverside) to recently completed facilities in Riverside and Blythe.
- (h) Riverside has built new facilities but not abandoned old facilities, therefore, they currently have more courtrooms than judges. Some courtrooms are larger than multi-defendant courtroom guidelines because of historic and physical constraints in the recent renovation of the County Courthouse.

(2) Evaluation – Key Findings:

- (a) Most buildings were found to be physically adequate in terms of resource potential. Condition issues are primarily related to system and age related deterioration
- (b) Most buildings were found to be functionally adequate and/or marginal. Marginal ratings were primarily related to lack of separate circulation systems for judicial and in-custody movement.
- (c) The Banning, Perris, and Indio Annex facilities should be considered for abandonment due to condition or functional suitability.
- (d) 40 of 92 courtrooms (47%) are in-custody capable relative to planning guidelines.
- (e) 82% of current space occupied was evaluated as adequate and 2% as marginal.

(3) Factors Affecting Planning

(a) Projected Growth:

- (i) Caseload projected to grow from 335,479 to 651,159 by 2020
- (ii) Judicial full time equivalents (FTE) projected to increase from 72 to 128 by 2020
- (iii) 357,531 component gross square feet is estimated as required for projected growth.
- (iv) Preliminary construction cost estimates: \$15.4 million to upgrade existing buildings, \$46.1 to \$72.1 million to address current unadjusted shortfalls, and \$69.25 million to meet projected growth through 2020. Ultimate costs will be affected by reuse/replacement options for each building and adjusted shortfalls.

(b) Reuse of Existing Facilities

- (i) Some facilities warrant replacement based on physical and functional conditions.
- (ii) Office/support space currently in leased space in Riverside should be consolidated with the courts for operational efficiency.
- (iii) County plans to construct a new Temecula court facility and close existing facilities in Temecula and Perris
- (iv) Some of the current sites (Hall of Justice, Blythe, Indio) have opportunities for building additions to existing court facilities and for co-locating court facilities with existing and proposed jails.

(c) Geography: Large County

- (i) The county is 185 miles wide, east to west. Most of the population is located in the west with the city of Blythe isolated in the east end of the county.

- (ii) Population centers follow major highway corridors (Interstates 10, 15 and 215).
 - (iii) County's geography is diverse with prominent mountains, valleys, and desert.
- (d) The court and county are committed to providing its people with reasonable access to the courts. All courts handle small claims and traffic and accept filings for other courts within the system. The courts are increasingly relying on technology to improve access.
- (e) Goal is to consolidate to greatest extent possible to reduce taxpayer costs while improving access.
- (4) Planning Options – goals are to (1) optimize use of existing sites and facilities, (2) consolidate court system, and (3) assure delivery of service to large county. Three options were presented:
 - (a) Option 1 – Maximum re-use of existing facilities
 - (b) Option 2 – Partial consolidation
 - (c) Option 3 – Maximum consolidation
- (5) Planning Committee – South review comments
 - (a) Committee suggested that an overview of the operational issues that affect the court system and planning options be discussed at the beginning of the presentation.
 - (b) Consultant should provide presentation of options to larger counties.
 - (c) Committee generally accepted the presented planning options for Riverside County.
- 7) Mr. Klass asked how changing the threshold for a deficient facility rating from the 60% to a 70% (adopted at the December 1999 task force meeting) affected the consultant's evaluation findings. Justice Kremer asked DMJM to run a test to determine the impact, if any. Mr. Cupples agreed to test Contra Costa County, which he feels would provide representative results for other counties, within a few weeks. Mr. Cupples noted that DMJM's studies and evaluations are apolitical and that the evaluation process is designed to maximize retention and use of existing court facilities.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No public comment was requested.

V. NAPA COURT PRESENTATION – Judge W. Scott Snowden

- 1) Napa was the first functionally consolidated court in California, combining superior and municipal court operations by the early 1990's. They also "spiritually" unified in the 1990's. They're now highly automated with no backlog.
- 2) Napa's court facilities are in good shape. They have a historic courthouse built in 1878 that is used for civil and family cases, a courtroom at the juvenile hall, and a new criminal courthouse. Strategic planning began in the 1970's with the court working with the Bar Association and other groups. In the mid 1970's a local task force was formed to study the court's facility needs. This resulted in a one million-dollar grant to update the courthouse. In the mid 1980's security concerns with moving prisoners from the jail to the court in chains on public streets and the need for more space prompted another review. This ultimately led to building a new criminal courthouse that opened in 1999 which is connected by tunnel to the jail. Prior to completion of the new courthouse, the historic hall of records that is immediately adjacent to the historic courthouse was renovated for court use. A new jury assembly room was built on the 2nd floor and received acclaim from the public for quality space that appropriately reflects the contributions of jurors.
- 3) The court maintains a close relationship with the county, its board of supervisors and other local agencies. The court encourages review of their programs and examination of the results achieved. The court does not fight other agencies but tries to understand their constraints and cooperate with them while remaining independent. An example of cooperation between the court and county is illustrated by the construction of a four defendant, four-juror courtroom for an upcoming gang related murder trial. The

courtroom was constructed in a very short time for this high profile case. A single trial will result in substantial operational savings for the court.

- 4) The courts current facility needs include:
 - Perimeter security and entry screening for the unsecured historic courthouse;
 - Consolidating scattered and deficient juvenile facilities to reduce cost and increase efficiency.
 - Improving parking, particularly for jurors.
 - 5) Judge Snowden thinks the task force is important because:
 - It will give the courts fundamental tools for justifying and building facilities,
 - People can work better if given the tools they need, and
 - The courthouse environment influences public satisfaction with the justice system.Proper facilities encourage respect for the court's processes and the legitimacy of the institution. A court's facility should reflect the importance of its work.
- Judge Snowden asked the Task Force not to punish proactive counties for being successful. They still have some problems and need financial assistance.

VI. PLANNING COMMITTEE–NORTH – Sheriff Robert Doyle, Chair, Mr. Andy Cupples and Ms. Kathleen Halaszynski

- 1) Judge Stephen Dombrink presented the Unification Working Group's report to this planning committee at their January 2000 meeting. See Item III-2 above.
- 2) Contra Costa County
 - a) Background
 - (1) Unified court system, all courts hear all cases.
 - (2) Organization mirrors former municipal districts – Mt. Diablo, Bay, Walnut Creek/Danville, Delta.
 - (3) 11 facilities, 47 courtrooms, 220,000 CGSF and 10 leased facilities housing support function.
 - (4) Most facilities have been in service 25+ years, the oldest historic courthouse is circa 1930, the newest major facility was built in 1986.
 - (5) County has adapted existing space for interim needs.
 - (6) 47 judicial positions.
 - (7) Partial centralization (family and criminal courts), but most courts hear all case types.
 - (8) County has recently completed a facilities master plan. Final recommendations are on hold pending completion of statewide facilities plan.
 - b) Evaluation
 - (1) Most buildings were found to be physically adequate in terms of resource potential, condition issues are primarily related to systems and age related deterioration.
 - (2) Most buildings were found to be functionally marginal, primarily related to lack of separate circulation systems for judicial and in-custody movement.
 - (3) Space restrictions in existing buildings has resulted in the use of off-site leased resources for critical support functions, impacting court operations.
 - (4) Several facilities warrant abandonment due to conditional or functional suitability (Veteran's Hall, Juvenile Hall/Lions Gate, Finance Building)
 - (5) Significant shortfall of in-custody capable courtrooms relative to the planning guidelines (17 of 47), even the newer Criminal Court uses public circulation for in-custody movement. 14 % of existing space was evaluated as deficient for current use per the guidelines.
 - c) Factors affecting planning:
 - (1) Projected growth
 - (a) Caseload is projected to grow from 190,248 to 281,105 by 2020.
 - (b) Judicial FTE's projected to increase from 46 to 63 by 2020.
 - (c) Projections closely track 2010 projections developed in recent county planning document.
 - (d) 158,058 CGSF additional space estimated as required for projected growth.

- (e) Preliminary construction cost estimates: (1) \$15 million to upgrade existing buildings, (2) \$20 to \$73 million to address current unadjusted shortfalls, and (3) \$39.5 million to meet projected growth through 2020.
 - (f) Ultimate cost will be affected by overall reuse/replacement options for each building and adjusted shortfalls.
- (2) Reuse of existing facilities:
 - (a) Some facilities warrant replacement based on physical and functional condition.
 - (b) Office support functions currently in lease space should be consolidated with courts for operational efficiencies.
 - (c) The reuse of several facilities may require a change in mission or inherent compromises of planning guidelines.
 - (i) Historic Courthouse - no separation of judicial and public movement possible.
 - (ii) Bray Criminal Courthouse – in-custody movement across public corridors.
 - (iii) Jail Annex – access to one arraignment courtroom requires in-custody movement across public corridor.
 - (iv) Most existing sites offer limited opportunities for expansion both for buildings and parking.
- (3) Geography: Contra Costa is a moderately sized county with population centers following the Interstate 80, Interstate 680 and Highway 4 corridors. The county has varied terrain (mountains, valleys, bay/river front) with urban, suburban, and rural areas.
- (4) Commitment to access to courts
 - (a) Small claims/traffic, cross filings.
 - (b) Service to fast growing eastern county
- (5) Recently completed master plan
 - (a) Alternative 1: “Status Quo” court calendars with partial decentralization following general versus limited jurisdiction model
 - (b) Alternative 2: Decentralize court calendars, decentralizing all cases heard in all facilities.
 - (c) Alternative 3: Centralized court calendars, centralizing all cases except traffic, small claims, and minor civil.
- (6) County is in the process of planning new Consolidated Family Court.
- d) Planning Options – goals are to (1) optimize use of existing sites and facilities, (2) optimize total system operation costs. Three options were presented:
 - (1) Option 1: “Status Quo” Calendaring with partial consolidation of family and juvenile.
 - (2) Option 2: Decentralize civil/criminal/small claims/traffic and consolidate family and juvenile.
 - (3) Option 3: Consolidated family, juvenile in-custody criminal and jury civil calendars with local service centers for other case types.
- e) Planning Committee – North comments
 - (1) All options appear viable.
 - (2) Need local input as basis for developing final capital plan recommendations.
 - (3) Final decision will require review of adjusted implementation costs for each option.
 - (4) Option 3 provides for the greatest reuse of existing facilities assuming that operational change is acceptable.
 - (5) Selection of approach should take into consideration facility implications of unification as presented by the working group.
 - (6) Consideration of access to courts is also a critical issue.
 - (7) Reuse existing facilities where possible.
 - (8) Consultant should finalize draft and present to local county and court in working meeting, not simply by transmittal.

- 3) Calaveras County
 - a) Background
 - (1) 1 court facility, 3 courtrooms, 6,259 CGSF
 - (2) Court facility is part of County Government Center in San Andreas
 - (a) Government Center is county owned, built in 1964 with 1/3 of its space used for court functions.
 - (3) 2.5 full time judicial equivalents.
 - b) Evaluation
 - (1) Existing courthouse lacks private/secure circulation, which limits in-custody use and general security for judicial officers. 2 of 3 courtrooms meet guidelines in other respects but one is also used for the Board of Supervisors.
 - (2) Current unadjusted space shortfalls were calculated at 26,369 CGSF with significant shortfalls in courtrooms, chambers, court administration and jury assembly based on current use.
 - (3) In-custody defendants are walked over from the adjacent jail on site.
 - c) Factors affecting planning
 - (1) Judicial FTE's projected to increase from 2.8 to 4.6 by 2020.
 - (2) 18,935 CGSF additional space estimated as required for projected growth.
 - (3) Preliminary construction cost estimates: (1) \$0.8 million to upgrade existing buildings, (2) \$5.3 to \$6.8 million to address current unadjusted shortfalls, and (3) \$4.8 million to meet projected growth through 2020.
 - (4) Ultimate cost will be affected by overall reuse/replacement options for building and adjusted shortfalls.
 - (5) Small courts county. Relatively low population density with scattered settlements.
 - (6) Commitment to County Government Center. All courts are on one site in San Andreas with all county government functions.
 - (7) Additional development at County Center is preferred. Master plan is in progress that will propose new court/detention facility at this location.
 - d) Planning Options:
 - (1) Option 1: Retain / expand existing building.
 - (a) Reuse 2 courtrooms, 1 hearing room for non-custody cases.
 - (b) Build new wing on existing building. Add 3 new in-custody capable courtrooms and correct other existing deficiencies.
 - (c) Add detention capacity to sheriff's building at the County Center.
 - (2) Option 2: Retain existing building / build new criminal court
 - (a) Reuse 2 courtrooms, 1 hearing room for non-custody cases.
 - (b) Build separate criminal courts building adjacent to proposed detention facility with 3 new in-custody capable courtrooms and related support space.
 - (c) Add detention center capacity to sheriff's building.
 - (3) Option 3: Build new courthouse
 - (a) Build new courthouse on-site with total of 5 in-custody courtrooms.
 - (b) Use existing courthouse for other agencies.
 - (c) Add detention center capacity in conjunction with new courthouse.
 - e) Planning Committee – North review comments
 - (1) Option 1 (expand existing court building/jail) will not likely produce an adequate result and has been discounted by the county.
 - (2) One commissioner is used part time, primarily for family court matters.
 - (3) Supervisor's room is only available 50% of the time for court functions.
 - (4) County hasn't considered decentralization, although population clusters exist in Murphy's, Angels Camp with new growth in the western and southwestern portions of the county. This suggests incorporation of "Service Center" courts on scheduled days for routine matters around the county.
 - (5) Another option suggested: 5 new courtrooms as an addition to the existing court building and re-use of existing court areas for other agencies.
- 4) Yolo County
 - a) Background

- (1) 3 court facilities comprising 220,000 CGSF with 10 courtrooms plus 10 leased facilities housing support functions.
 - (2) Current facilities are clustered in downtown Woodland.
 - (3) The County Courthouse is a multi-purpose court facility with 8 courtrooms. The building is a historic structure.
 - (4) The Old Jail Building is located across the street from the County Courthouse and contains one courtroom used for criminal trials. The court is adjacent to the Central Holding facility.
 - (5) International Order of Foresters (I.O.O.F) Building is leased space used for traffic and small claims. It contains one courtroom and one chambers. The county is planning to replace this facility.
 - (6) There are currently 10 judicial positions.
- b) Evaluation
- (1) Existing County Courthouse lacks private/secure circulation, which limits in-custody use and creates poor security for judicial officers. Only 4 of 8 courtrooms meet the trial court facility guidelines.
 - (2) The Old Jail Facility works well for criminal trials but only has one courtroom.
 - (3) Facilities in the I.O.O.F. Building are deficient. The county plans to construct a new traffic courtroom in another part of the Old Jail Facility.
 - (4) Current unadjusted shortfalls were calculated at 65,682 CGSF with significant shortfalls in courtrooms, court administration, and jury assembly based on current facility use.
 - (5) Five courtrooms are adequate and four are rated as marginal.
- c) Factors affecting planning
- (1) Projected growth
 - (a) Judicial FTE's projected to increase from 10 to 15 by 2020.
 - (b) 65,682 CGSF additional space estimated as required for projected growth.
 - (c) Preliminary construction cost estimates: (1) \$1.4 million to upgrade existing buildings, (2) \$9.5 to \$16.8 million to address current unadjusted shortfalls, and (3) \$12.2 million to meet projected growth through 2020.
 - (d) Ultimate cost will be affected by overall reuse/replacement options for each building and adjusted shortfalls.
 - (2) Planning issues
 - (a) Medium courts county with moderate population density with scattered development.
 - (b) Centralized courts system. Multi-purpose judges with limited specialization by case type.
 - (c) Commitment to the County Government Center. All courts are clustered in downtown Woodland that is the primary location of other county government functions.
 - (d) Alternate development outside of the downtown area at the New Jail Site is an option.
 - (e) Downtown focus with parking difficulties.
- d) Planning options
- (1) Option 1: Retain existing courthouse and build new downtown criminal courthouse.
 - (a) Retain the existing County Courthouse, reusing 8 courtrooms for non-custody cases.
 - (b) Retain existing Old Jail building and continue to use the courtroom for criminal cases.
 - (c) Relocate existing traffic court to the Old Jail Building
 - (d) Build a separate criminal courts building adjacent to the Old Jail Building with 5 in-custody capable courtrooms.
 - (2) Option 2: Retain existing courthouse and build new criminal courthouse at New Jail Building site.

- (a) Retain existing County Courthouse, reusing 8 courtrooms for non-custody cases.
- (b) Relocate existing traffic court to the Old Jail Building.
- (c) Abandon in-custody use of Old Jail Building courtroom, reuse as traffic court.
- (d) Build separate criminal courts building adjacent to the New Jail outside of town with 6 new in-custody courtrooms.
- (3) Option 3: New replacement courthouse
 - (a) Abandon courts use of existing County Courthouse, Old Jail Building, and I.O.O.F. Building and re-use for other county functions.
 - (b) Build a new 15-courtroom facility at either downtown or at the New Jail Site.
- (4) Planning Committee – North review comments:
 - (a) Options described seem viable.
 - (b) Generic problem of seniority dictating physical courtroom/chambers assignments versus where cases are best heard.
 - (c) Option 1 is best in terms of community courts image because it keeps courts downtown and leaves flexibility for future change (through expansion in existing Old Jail Facility site)
 - (d) Need local input as basis for developing final capital plan recommendations.
 - (e) Final decision will require review of adjusted implementation costs for each option.
 - (f) Suggested another option: put new traffic courtroom in Old Jail Facility, build 2 new criminal courts downtown and do video arraignment at the New Jail.

VII. PHASE 5 - IMPLEMENTATION PLAN – Mr. David Janssen, Chair, Mr. Jay Smith & Mr. Tom Gardner

- 1) Mr. Smith recapped the phase 5 process, noting the following tasks:
 - a) Initial research and education,
 - b) Consensus on key Issues,
 - c) Designing an organizational and fiscal structure, and
 - d) Recommending a transition plan.
- 2) Mr. Janssen and Mr. Smith reviewed issues on which the committee has reached consensus. Key committee agreements are:
 - a) Organizational responsibilities and financial responsibilities should be together.
 - b) The Judiciary, as a separate branch of government, should be responsible for court facilities as well as court operations and staff.
 - c) A state-based model should be explored.
 - d) The long-term goal is state responsibility for all court facilities including capital investment, facility maintenance and operations.
Members discussed what “control” of court facilities means and whether or not transfer of capital assets is necessary to achieve it. Also discussed was control of a single building (ownership, operations and maintenance) versus control of a system of buildings (asset management). No decisions were made on facility ownership.
 - e) “Revenue neutral” transfer.
 - f) Facilities for new judges and support staff should be the state’s responsibility.
 - g) At some point in the future, the state should assume all responsibility for renovation/replacement costs and maintenance should be budgeted as part of facilities operations.
 - h) The Judicial Council should act as the governing body for the administration and financing of court facilities. Specific Judicial Council, other state, and local court responsibilities need to be defined.
 - i) The Judicial Council should administer their facility responsibilities, however they are defined, through its Administrative Office of the Courts and provide appropriate staff and other resources.

- j) Major capital facilities projects should be financed with local fees and revenues and state funds or bonds. Ongoing maintenance should be part of the state's annual budget process.
- 3) Mr. Klass asked how the Task Force on Trial Court Employee's recommendations would work. Mr. Abel responded that the employees' task force recommended that people working for the courts become court employees. Local courts would be responsible for negotiating salaries and conditions of employment. Court employees would still be tied to their counties personnel system for benefits such as retirement and deferred compensation. Court employees would not be state civil service employees. This special status will require legislation. The budget for court operations (including employees' salaries) is tied to the state process and involves AOC, Department of Finance, legislature, and the Governor. Mr. Abel explained AOC's Trial Court Budget Commission noting that the Department of Finance, legislature, and Governor does not review individual county budgets but rather program changes.
- 4) The committee's next steps were reviewed:
- a) Establish the functional structure, based upon authority.
 - b) Describe how the organization works including responsibilities and functions.
 - c) Define the scope of capital development and facilities management.
 - d) Determine the organizational resources (staff and budget) needed.
 - e) Define the specific actions required to move from the current system to the new.
 - f) Develop timeframes for implementation.
 - g) Establish required resources (staff and budget) related to transition and implementation.
- 5) Mr. Smith and Mr. Gardner discussed how a state court facilities system might work. They outlined the following possibility while noting facility responsibility and control could vary based upon the degree of local court control desired:
- a) Funding
 - (1) Local courts would request project funds.
 - (2) AOC would prioritize projects.
 - (3) DOF would review projects/requests for funds.
 - (4) Governor and legislature would approve funds.
 - (5) AOC would manage project funding.
 - b) Judicial Council role:
 - (1) Establish need and set priorities.
 - (2) Review and approve capital projects.
 - (3) Review and approve facility designs.
 - (4) Ensure compliance with standards.
 - (5) Establish and maintain facility databases.
 - (6) Review and approve operations and management budgets.
 - c) Shared roles:
 - (1) Hiring consultants.
 - (2) Architectural program review.
 - (3) Design review.
 - d) Local court roles:
 - (1) Operation and maintenance management.
 - (2) Facility lease management.
 - (3) Assessment of need.
 - (4) Siting recommendations.
 - (5) Minor capital improvements.
 - e) AOC's options for outsourcing
 - (1) Partnership with DGS
 - (2) Use of counties or private vendors for planning, technical assistance, and/or project management.

- 6) The Finance and Implementation Committee must still address the following outstanding issues:
 - a) Funding by project or lump sum?
 - b) Sources of funds.
 - (1) Operational from annual support budget?
 - (2) Major capital facilities from bonds or other resources?
 - (3) Pursuing other revenues.

Mr. Gardner discussed the Criminal Justice and Courthouse Construction Funds. These funds are generated from fines. The amount contributed to the funds varies by county and is set by the local board of supervisors. It was noted that counties do not extensively use the Governor's Infrastructure Bank and suggested that the consultant investigate the possibility of changing the fund to include court construction. Increasing civil filing fees to support court construction was also discussed. Riverside, San Francisco, and San Bernardino have legislative authority to add a surcharge to civil filing fees to support court construction. Each court's program, however, is different. The impact of raising civil filing fees needs to be studied before recommending a statewide program.
 - c) How do we maintain progress on proposed projects ("pipeline")? How do we maintain effective maintenance during transition? Does the task force want to design remedies for these issues?
 - d) Defining "revenue neutrality" :
 - (1) Debt and revenue transfers.
 - (2) Facility planning and management resources.
 - (3) Facility maintenance resources.
 - (4) Financing facility deficiencies and shortfalls.
 - e) Will the state assume all properties as is? Under what terms will they accept them?
 - f) Rules for transferring property:
 - (1) Achieving acceptable condition.
 - (2) Prioritizing properties to be transferred.
 - (3) Transferring documentation and title.
 - (4) Transferring resource to maintain facilities.
 - (5) Agreements on historical use.
 - (6) Agreements on mixed use.
- 7) Scope of responsibilities
 - a) Capital outlay
 - (1) \$1.8 billion in renovation
 - (2) \$700 million in new capital in first ten years
 - (3) \$700 million in new capital in second ten years.
 - b) Operations and Maintenance
 - (1) Base of 14.8 million square feet
 - (2) Additional growth of 21 million square feet
 - (3) \$21.5 million operating expenses
 - (4) \$1.5 million per year growth in cost
- 8) Transition elements:
 - a) Authorizing legislation.
 - b) Securing funding or organization.
 - c) Building organizational capacity at AOC.
 - d) Building partnerships with DGS.
 - e) Building partnerships with counties / private providers.
 - f) Refining the capital plan
 - g) Transferring responsibility (property). Mr. Klass noted that transferring property would be a multi-year process (2 to 5 years).

- 9) Phase 5 timeline/milestones:
 - a) First draft of the Finance and Implementation Committee's interim report will be reviewed in May.
 - b) Second draft of the interim report will be reviewed in July.
 - c) Consultants will integrate survey results into interim report in August.
 - d) The interim report approved by committee will be reviewed by the task force at its Santa Barbara meeting (August 30, 2000).
- 10) Task force members asked that a working draft of implementing legislation be developed now and circulated for public comment with the task force's Second Interim Report. Task force members felt that they were not required by AB 233 to develop a detailed organizational structure with resources necessary to implement the task force's recommendations. Members felt that staff outside of the task force could best develop organizational models.

VIII. NAPA COURT TOUR

- 1) Mr. Jose Guillen, Napa Court Executive, led the task force members on a tour of the Napa Court facilities. The group toured the historic courthouse built in 1878 and currently used for civil and family court matters. They toured the court's spacious and modern jury assembly room adjacent to the historic courthouse. The jury assembly room was converted from the county's former hall of records a few years ago to provide jurors with a pleasant, comfortable space in sharp contrast to the dark basement room formerly used. The group then toured the new courthouse that was completed and occupied in 1999. All criminal trials are held here. The new courthouse is linked to the county jail by a basement level tunnel that terminates at the court's holding facilities. Prior to construction of the new court, prisoners were walked in chains on public streets to the historic courthouse. The court has complete perimeter screening, and three circulation systems (public, private, & in-custody). Courtrooms are well designed to handle criminal and civil proceedings. The new courthouse replaced a former municipal court facility that will eventually revert to county use. Members toured space in the former municipal court that was altered to accommodate a four defendant, four jury murder trial; the first four jury trial in the nation. The four-jury courtroom is a temporary facility with state of the art audio-visual technology.